



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Colin
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/471,659	12/24/1999	LLOYD D. CLARK JR.	59.0021	7775
26751	7590	01/10/2006	EXAMINER	
BRIGITTE ECHOLS SCHLUMBERGER WELLS SERVICES 200 GILLINGHAM LANE, MD-9 SUGAR LAND, TX 77478				ODOM, CURTIS B
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2634	

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/471,659	CLARK ET AL.
	Examiner Curtis B. Odom	Art Unit 2634

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 12 December 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 2-9, 12-17, 20-26, and 28-36 as in Office Action 9/20/2005.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See attachment.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____.

Response to Arguments

1. The declarations under 37 CFR 1.132 filed 12/12/2005 are insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 2-9, 12-17, 20-26 and 28-36 based upon Matsumoto, Bae, Isaksson, Van Kerchove, Tzannes, Rasmussen, Gardner, and Baid as set forth in the last Office action because the claims as recited still do not constitute patentability. It is still the understanding of the examiner that DMT modulation does not recognize its environment or propagation medium. Of course, in order to implement DMT modulation, one could not use the same cables as that of telephony. However, simply because the cables used in well-logging are longer than the cables used in telephony, does not provide a reason as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would not render implementing DMT modulation into a well-logging (cable) system as obvious. DMT modulation can be implemented into wireless technology which can span an area much greater than any man-made cable. DMT modulation is performed before the signal is transmitted through a propagation medium. Thus, how is it that the propagation medium (whether it be a cable, air, or water) affects the performance of DMT modulation? The propagation medium/environment may affect the transmitted signal, but it does not affect the process of producing the transmitted signal. The different cables used in well-logging to transmit the signal from one device to the next do not affect the DMT modulation performed in the devices. There may be more power needed to transmit the DMT signal through the cable but this still does not affect process of DMT modulation before the signal is transmitted. The arguments provided in the declarations are drawn to the signal after it is transmitted (length of cables, temperatures, etc.). However, DMT modulation is performed before the signal is transmitted, thus, the length

of cables and the temperatures of the propagation medium do not affect the process of producing a DMT signal. The propagation medium may affect the types of cables used, but it does not affect the process of DMT. Thus, it is still the understanding of the examiner that since the environment/propagation medium does not affect the actual DMT modulation process (as shown by DMT being implemented in not only cable but also wireless systems) that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art the time the invention was made to implement DMT modulation in a well-logging system which uses cables as a propagation medium.

Conclusion

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Curtis B. Odom whose telephone number is 571-272-3046. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday, 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Chin can be reached on 571-272-3056. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Curtis Odom
December 21, 2005



STEPHEN CHIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINE
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600